

REMARKS

Applicants have compared the substantive portion of this Office Action (items 2 and 3 on pages 2-4) with paragraphs 18 and 19 of the Office Action dated March 10, 2005, and note that the former appears to be identical to the latter, except for the last two sentences in item 3 on page 4 of the current amendment. Accordingly, Applicants hereby incorporate by reference the Remarks set forth in the previously submitted amendment dated February 7, 2006.

With regard to the last two sentences of item 3, Applicants acknowledge that the Tuffias et al reference at Column 6, line 12 refers to protecting the exposed side of a platinum group metallic object by applying a thin oxide ceramic or metal layer. Moreover, at Column 9, lines 61-64, referred to in the Office Action, Tuffias et al suggests applying an oxidation resistant coating to a structural composite which is to be used in an oxidizing environment.

The Office Action is not specific with respect to exactly which claims this portion of the disclosure is believed to be relevant; however, it would appear that these comments are directed towards Claims 17 and 18 which recite a step of applying a metal coating at least to surface areas of the composite material that have the channel shaped spaces.

U.S. Appln. Serial No. 10/717,614
Response to Office Action Dated:
Reply to Office Action Mailed: June 30, 2006
Attorney Docket No. 010739.51198D1

Applicants do not claim to have invented the generic technique of applying a metal coating to the surface of a composite material. However, Applicants do respectfully submit that disclosure in Tuffias et al falls far short of teaching or suggesting the process steps in Claims 17 and 18, in which a metal coating is applied at least to the surface areas of the composite materials that have the channel shaped spaces such as recited in Claims 16/15/11. As noted in paragraph [0016], such a metallic coating provides an additional seal and load bearing reinforcement of the channel structures, which therefore better fulfill the requirements imposed on the coolant, which flows through the channels. The claims therefore define a process which goes well beyond the mere recitation in Tuffias et al that the "exposed side" of a platinum group metal, or a structure composite item, may be coated with "an oxidation resistant coating".

In light of the foregoing remarks, this application should be in condition for allowance, and early passage of this case to issue is respectfully requested. If there are any questions regarding this amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and

U.S. Appln. Serial No. 10/717,614
Response to Office Action Dated:
Reply to Office Action Mailed: June 30, 2006
Attorney Docket No. 010739.51198D1

please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (Docket #010739.51198D1).

Respectfully submitted,



Gary R. Edwards
Registration No. 31,824

CROWELL & MORING LLP
Intellectual Property Group
P.O. Box 14300
Washington, DC 20044-4300
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844
GRE:kms:aw
2855602_1